



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,433	12/17/2001	Andreas Bode	1546.014US1	2331

21186 7590 06/17/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 2938  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938

EXAMINER
----------

RAYYAN, SUSAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/023,433

Applicant(s)

BODE ET AL.

Examiner

Susan F. Rayyan

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-89 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 26-89 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17-25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Ry

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-89 are pending.
2. Amendment filed on January 24, 2005 has been considered.
3. IDS filed on 2/2/04 (paper# 4) has been considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-7,9-11,13-16,26-33,38-46,54-57,59-67,69,73-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al (US 2003/0014405 A1) and Neal et al (US 6,324,534).**

As per claims 1,26,54 Shapiro teaches:

- (a) obtaining from a user a user query including at least some language at parg. 20, lines 5-7;
- (b) performing a search for documents relevant to the user query using at least one search criteria at parg. 26.

Shapiro does not explicitly teach evaluating a first search result returned by the first search to determine whether to perform a subsequent search using different search criteria and selected from a set of search criteria, the set of search criteria including at

Art Unit: 2167

least two different search criteria defining different search specificities when using identical terms from the user query language however Neal does teach this limitation at col.5, lines 54-60,col.7, lines 35-40,50-58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to expand a search strategy to avoid situations wherein the search fails to identify the desired item with in the data set at col.7, lines 28-33.

As per claim 2 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
if a subsequent search is indicated by (c), modifying the search criteria and repeating (b) and (c) at col.6, lines 48-50.

As per claim 3 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including, if a subsequent search is indicated by (c), modifying the search criteria and repeating (b) and (c) unless a list of different searches has been exhausted at col.6, lines 48-50, co.8, lines 6-10.

As per claim 4 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro teaches:  
further including: (d) returning a list of documents to the user at parg. 30, lines 1-2.

As per claim 5 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
ranking documents and) returning a list of ranked documents to the user at col.7, lines 48-50.

As per claims 6, 56 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the ranking of a particular document is based at least in part on which performed search returned that particular document at col.7, lines 48-55.

As per claims 7, 57 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the ranking of a particular document is based at least in part on a degree to which a particular document satisfied the search criteria associated with the particular performed search that returned that particular document a at col.7, lines 48-55.

As per claim 9 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including determining a characteristic of the subsequent search based at least in part on the first search result at col.7, lines 14.

As per claim 10 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which determining a characteristic of the subsequent search includes formulating more specific criteria than criteria of the first search at col.7, lines 55-65.

As per claims 11,14 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which determining the characteristic of the subsequent search includes determining, based at least in part on the first search result, at least one of:  
a criteria of the subsequent search within a dimension, a dimension of the subsequent search criteria, a search ordering of the subsequent search with respect to other subsequent searches having different criteria or dimensions, and a scheme in which the search ordering is traversed at at col.6, lines 48-65.

As per claim 13 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including selecting a search strategy based at least in part on the user query at col.5, lines 53-60.

As per claim 15 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including classifying the user query into a query class, and in which the selecting the search strategy is based on the query class in which the user query is classified at col.7, lines 55-65.

As per claim 16 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which classifying the user query includes:  
parsing the user query into information-bearing terms, based at least in part on any noninformation-bearing stopwords included in the user query and classifying the user query into a query class based on at least one of:  
how many information-bearing terms are obtained from the user-query, how many words are included in the information-bearing terms obtained from the user query at col.6, lines 35-47.

As per claims 27,46 Shapiro teaches:  
obtaining from a user a user query including at least some language at parg. 20, lines 5-7;  
returning a list of the documents returned by the at least one search that was performed parg. 30, lines 1-2.

Shapiro does not explicitly teach using an ordered list of  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$  of at least two searches, each search using at least one search criteria that is different from the other searches, the search criteria selected from a multidimensional set of search criteria, the set of search criteria including at least two different dimensions representing different approaches of varying search specificity performing a search for documents

Art Unit: 2167

relevant to the user query using one of the S 1, S2, . . . , SN searches, starting with the S1 search, evaluating search results corresponding to the search performed to determine whether to perform a subsequent search and, if the search results yielded an insufficient number of documents relevant to the user query, moving to and performing another search in the list however Neal does teach these limitations at col.5, lines 54-60,col.7, lines 35-40,50-58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to expand a search strategy to avoid situations wherein the search fails to identify the desired item with in the data set at col.7, lines 28-33.

As per claim 28 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
which the using the ordered list includes using a list ordered at least substantially according to specificity of the search criteria, in which S1 provides at least approximately more specific search criteria than S2, . . . , SN, and in which SN provides at least approximately more general search criteria than S1, S2, . . . , S (N-1) at col.6, lines 55-65.

As per claims 29,65 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which S 1 provides more specific search criteria than S2, . . . , SN, and in which SN provides more general search criteria than S1,S2, ... S (N-1) at col. 7, lines 55-65.

As per claims 30,66 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:

in which the using the ordered list includes using a list ordered throughout according to specificity of the search criteria at col.7, lines 55-57.

As per claims 31,67 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the list is ordered dynamically based at least in part on a result obtained from a previously-executed search on the user query at col.8, lines 6-10.

As per claim 32 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro teaches:  
in which the search criteria use the language from the user query at parg. 25, lines 1-4

As per claims 33,69 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the at least approximately more specific search criteria uses an at least approximately more exact matching between a particular term in the user query language in the documents, and the more general search criteria uses an at least approximately less exact matching of the particular term from the user query to the particular term in the documents at col.7, lines 55-62.

As per claims 38 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including, before the returning the list, ranking the documents at col.7, lines 48-50.

As per claims 39,74 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the ranking of a particular document is based at least in part on which of the at least one performed searches returned that particular document at col. 7, lines 48-55.

As per claims 40, 75 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:



in which the ranking of a particular document is based at least in part on a degree to which a particular document satisfied the search criteria associated with the at least one performed searches that returned that particular document at col. 7, lines 48-55.

As per claims 41,76 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the ranking of a particular document is based at least in part on a weight with which the particular document is associated with a particular concept node at col. 7, lines 48-55.

As per claims 42,60,78 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including forming the ordered list based at least in part on the user query col. 7, lines 55-65.

As per claim 43, 79 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including classifying the user query, and in which forming the ordered list based at least in part on the user query includes forming the ordered list based at least in part on the classification of the user query at col. 7, lines 55-65.

As per claims 44,80 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including adjusting the ordered list based at least in part on search results from a previous search on the obtained user query at col8, lines 5-10

As per claim 45,81 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the insufficient number of documents is determined by at least one of:

too few documents, too many documents, and the number of documents being outside a pre determined range at col.8, lines 5-10.

As per claims 55,73 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including a result ranking engine, coupled to the search engine output to rank documents returned in at least one search result, the result ranking engine including an output user interface at col.7, lines 49-51.

As per claims 59,77 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the content provider includes an ordered list of searches executed by the search engine if indicated by the search result evaluator at abstract.

As per claim 61 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the search query generator classifies the user query and forms the ordered list based at least in part on the classification of the user query at col.6, lines 20-26 and col.6, lines 35-65.

As per claim 62 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which search query generator modifies the ordered list based at least in part on a search result provided by the search engine at col.8, lines 6-10 and col.6, lines 48-51.

As per claim 63 Shapiro teaches:  
a user query input to receive a user query at parg. 20, lines 5-7.

Shapiro does not explicitly teach a search query generator, coupled to the user query input, the search query generator to generate an ordered list of  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$  of at least two searches using the user query to formulate corresponding search criteria,

each search including at least one criteria that is different from the other searches, the search criteria selected from a set of search criteria, the set of search criteria including at least two different search criteria defining different search specificities when using identical terms from the user query language, a search engine, including an input coupled to the search query generator and an output, the search engine using the search criteria to perform ones of the S1, S2, ..., SN searches, starting with the S1 search, and to provide a corresponding search result at the search engine output, a search result evaluator, coupled to the search engine output and an input of the search query generator, the search result evaluator to evaluate the search result to determine whether to perform a subsequent search from the ordered list based on whether existing search results yielded an insufficient number of documents relevant to the user query however Neal does teach these limitations at col. 5, lines 54-60, col.7, lines 35-40-67, col.8, lines 5-10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to expand a search strategy to avoid situations wherein the search fails to identify the desired item within the data set at col.7, lines 28-33.

As per claim 64 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the list is ordered at least substantially according to specificity of the search criteria, in which S1 provides at least approximately more specific search criteria than S2, ..., SN, and in which SN provides at least approximately more general search criteria than S1, S2, ..., S(N-1) at col.7, lines 55-65.

**6. Claims 8,12, 58, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al (US 2003/0014405 A1) and Neal et al (US 6,324,534) and further in view of Russell et al (US 6,598,047).**

As per claim 8 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach in which the ranking of a particular document is based at least in part on a weight with which the particular document is associated with a particular concept node in one of multiple taxonomies however Russell does teach this limitation at col.5, lines 40-68. It would have been on obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to distinguish between different conceptual spaces that might be investigated by a given user at col. 5, lines 57-60.

As per claim 12 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach in which the determining the scheme in which the search ordering is traversed includes using an approximately binary divide-and-conquer traversal of the search ordering however Russell does teach this limitation at col.5, lines 40-68. It would have been on obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to distinguish between different conceptual spaces that might be investigated by a given user at col. 5, lines 57-60.

As per claim 58 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach further including a knowledge corpus including documents associated with concept nodes arranged in multiple taxonomies, and in which the result ranking engine ranks a particular document based at least in part on a weight with which the

particular document is associated with a particular concept node however Russell does teach this limitation at col.5, lines 40-68. It would have been on obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to distinguish between different conceptual spaces that might be investigated by a given user at col. 5, lines 57-60.

**7. Claims 86 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al (US 2003/0014405 A1) and Neal et al (US 6,324,534) and Dogpile, web.archive.org, 1996 further in view of Russell et al (US 6,598,047).**

As per claim 86 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro, Neal and Dogpile do not explicitly teach in which moving to and performing another search in the list includes moving through the list in an at least approximately binary strategy that divides a portion of the list to be searched into two segments and selects a particular segment of the list based on an evaluation of the search results however Russell does teach this limitation at col.5, lines 40-68. It would have been on obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to distinguish between different conceptual spaces that might be investigated by a given user at col. 5, lines 57-60.

**8. Claims 34,68,82,85,87-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al (US 2003/0014405 A1) and Neal et al (US 6,324,534) and further in view of Dogpile, web.archive.org, 1996).**

As per claims 34, 68 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach in which specificity of the search criteria varies along at least two of a textual dimension, a linguistic dimension, and a thesaurus dimension however Dogpile does teach this limitation at page 1, searches. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to efficiently search for desired data.

As per claims 82 Shapiro teaches:  
obtaining from a user a user query including at least some language at parg. 20, lines 5-7.

Shapiro does not explicitly teach using an ordered list of S 1, S2, . . . , SN searches, each search using at least one search criteria taken from a plurality of dimensions, each dimension including a plurality of search criteria . . . ,performing a search for documents relevant to the user query using one of the S1, S2, . . . , SN searches, starting with the S1 search, evaluating search results corresponding to the search performed to determine whether to perform a subsequent search and, if the search results yielded an insufficient number of documents relevant to the user query, moving to and performing another search in the list, ranking the documents, returning a ranked list of the documents returned by the at least one search that was performed however Neal does teach these limitations at col. 5, lines 54-60, col.7, lines 35-40-67, col.8, lines 5-10. It

Art Unit: 2167

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to expand a search strategy to avoid situations wherein the search fails to identify the desired item with in the data set at col.7, lines 28-33.

Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach plurality of dimensions including at least two different dimensions representing different approaches of varying search specificity however Dogpile does teach this limitation at page 1, searches. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to efficiently search for desired data.

As per claim 85 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which moving to and performing another search in the list includes moving to and performing the next search in the list at abstract.

As per claim 87 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the ordered list is one of a plurality of ordered search lists that are mapped to query classes, and further including evaluating the user query for classification into a particular one of the query classes and using an ordered search list corresponding to said particular one of the query classes at col.6, lines 35-47.

As per claim 88 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro anticipates:  
further including reclassifying the user query to a different one of the query classes if results of a performed search provide an indication for such a reclassification at parg.32.

As per claim 89 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:

in which the ordered list is one of a plurality of ordered lists, and further including switching to a different one of the ordered lists if results of a performed search provide an indication for such a switching at col. col.7, lines 55-67.

**9. Claims 35-37,47-53,70-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al (US 2003/0014405 A1) and Neal et al (US 6,324,534) and further in view of Cragun et al (US 2003/0055810).**

As per claims 35,70 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach in which the search criteria specifies at least one predefined portion of the documents to be used in carrying out the search however Cragun does teach this limitation at prg. 13, lines 3-8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited reference t obtain an efficient hit list at prg. 10.

As per claim 36, 71 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach in which the at least approximately more specific search criteria uses a more specific portion of the documents, and the at least approximately more general search criteria uses a less specific portion of the documents search however Cragun does teach this limitation at prg. 13, lines 3-8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited reference t obtain an efficient hit list at prg. 10.



As per claims 37, 72 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach in which the predefined portion of the documents uses at least one of a title portion, a summary portion, and an abstract portion at search at parg. 13

As per claims 47,53 Shapiro teaches:  
obtaining from a user a user query including at least some language at parg. 20, lines 5-7.

Shapiro does not explicitly teach using an ordered list of  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$  of at least two searches, each search using at least one search criteria that is different from the other searches, in which list is ordered substantially according to specificity of the search criteria, in which  $S_1$  provides at least approximately more specific search criteria than  $S_2, \dots, S_N$ , and in which  $S_N$  provides at least approximately more general search criteria than  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{(N-1)}$ , performing a search for documents relevant to the user query using one of the  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$  searches, starting with the  $S_1$  search, evaluating search results corresponding to the search performed to determine whether to perform a subsequent search and, if the search results yielded an insufficient number of documents relevant to the user query, moving to and performing another search in the list, ranking the documents returning a ranked list of the documents returned by the at least one search that was performed however Neal does teach these limitations at col. 5, lines 54-60, col.7, lines 35-40-67, col.8, lines 5-10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to expand a search strategy to avoid situations wherein the search fails to identify the desired item with in the data set at col.7, lines 28-33.

Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach wherein the search criteria is selected from a set of search criteria that includes at least two different search criteria that specify different regions of the document to be used in carrying out the search however Cragun does teach this limitation at parg. 13, lines 3-8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited reference to obtain an efficient hit list at prg. 10.

As per claim 48 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the ranking of a particular document is based at least in part on which of the at least one performed searches returned that particular document at col. 7, lines 48-55.

As per claim 49 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the ranking of a particular document is based at least in part on a degree to which a particular document satisfied the search criteria associated with the at least one performed searches that returned that particular document at col. 7, lines 48-55.

As per claim 50 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
further including forming the ordered list based at least in part on the user query col. 7, lines 55-65.

As per claim 51 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the at least approximately more specific search criteria uses an at least approximately more exact matching between a particular term in the user query language in the documents, and the more general search criteria uses an at least approximately less exact matching of the particular term from the user query to the particular term in the documents at col.7, lines 55-62.

As per claim 52 same as claim arguments above and Neal teaches:  
in which the insufficient number of documents is determined by at least one of:  
too few documents, too many documents, and the number of documents being outside  
a pre determined range at col.8, lines 5-10.

**10. Claims 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al (US 2003/0014405 A1) and Neal et al (US 6,324,534) and Dogpile, web.archive.org, 1996) further in view of Cragun et al (US 2003/0055810).**

As per claim 83 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro, Neal and Dogpile do not explicitly teach in which the list is ordered according to a varying specificity along each particular dimension while holding specificity of other dimensions constant however Cragun does teach this limitation at par. 13, lines 3-8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited reference to obtain an efficient hit list at par. 10.

As per claim 84 same as claim arguments above and Shapiro and Neal do not explicitly teach in which each search in the ordered list includes a criteria from each dimension however Cragun does teach this limitation at par. 13, lines 3-8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited reference to obtain an efficient hit list at par. 10.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

11. Claims 17-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments, pages 18-26, filed January 24, 2005 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-17, 19, 26-89 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Shapiro have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made (see rejection above).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-89 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4117. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for

Art Unit: 2167

Official communications, (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications and (703) 746-7240 for Status inquiries and draft communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

 6/13/05  
Susan Rayyan

  
Primary Examiner